

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

Edu-Care

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications		Lesson matches original description	Satisfactory	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Satisfactory	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting		Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
		Student/instructor ratio: 2-1:1	Satisfactory		

ACTION NEEDED: NONE

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Edu-Care's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2005-2006 school year, only an observation was completed for the 2006-2007 school year).

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Edu-Care

SITE: 3815 Pierce Street (Edu-Care's main office)

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): Ms. R & Ms. Y

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 2

DATE: March 17, 2007

REVIEWERS: MC/ST

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 11:40 a.m.

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of "Satisfactory" (S) or "Unsatisfactory" (U) for each component. Providers receiving a "U" in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application	X		One student worked individually with a tutor on a math workbook page. The lesson involved adding and multiplying monetary amounts. The tutor used coins as manipulatives for the student to use to answer questions. The tutor asked the student to select the appropriate coins and then add or multiply the coins to answer the workbook page questions. Two other students worked with a tutor on math workbook pages on division. The students solved problems on their own and after each problem the tutor reviewed their responses and provided appropriate feedback and coaching when necessary. Folders for each student were present in an activity box in the tutoring room. Observed lessons match description in provider's original application.
Instruction is clear	X		Tutors provided clear directions to students and clarified when/if students sought additional guidance. Tutors questioned students to check for comprehension before allowing them to proceed in their work. However, it wasn't always clear how or if the lessons were matched to each individual student's ability level or whether each student had an individual instructional plan. For example, one tutor recognized after a 20 -25 minutes that a math workbook page and lesson was above one of the student's ability levels and switched to a lesson that more appropriately matched the student's math level. Although it was definitely appropriate to change the lesson, it was not clear why the student's lesson began at the higher level originally.
Time on task is appropriate	X		The students were very involved in their math lessons. They worked diligently on completing their assignments and did not have to be redirected to stay on task.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	X		The tutors seemed well aware of each student's strengths and areas for improvement. Tutors maintained a good rapport with the students and provided encouragement and positive feedback when appropriate. Tutors were very skilled at using appropriate instructional methods for students. For example, one tutor offered a student multiple suggestions to help the student count without using his fingers when completing addition or multiplication activities. Another tutor provided students with strategies on solving division problems on their own and coached the students without simply giving them the answers when the students were challenged.
Student/instructor ratio: <u>2-1:1</u>	X		Application notes that the ratio will be 10:1 and that instruction will be in small groups. A 2-1:1 ratio and small group instruction were observed.

